

Remarks

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 was rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the network" on line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This has been resolved with amendment to claim 1 above. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0091028).

Chang teaches a phone network using gateway servers and PBXs. See Figs. 54 and 55. The instant application does not use a PBX at all, as the PBX is replaced by the VoX network. Further, the implementation of supplementary services in Chang is done by adapting the IP network to provide those services, the system in Chang does not rely upon previously existing messages to implement supplementary services.

Further, the globally significant message of the instant invention as claimed is an actual message. Merely encapsulating the contents of a message into an IP packet does not constitute a globally significant message, as there is no message separate from the locally significant message. Without the locally significant message in Chang, there would be no globally significant message, while the two messages in the current application are different.

As amended, claims 1 and 13 require that the locally significant message be mapped to a globally significant message. Mapping between two establish messages is far different from merely encapsulating a message to be transmitted across a network.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of all claims is requested.

Claims 2-9, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Thornton (US Patent No. 6,363,065).

Thornton does not teach the insertion of a locally significant message into a globally significant message, much less the mapping of one message into another. Therefore, the addition of Thornton to the combination does not overcome the deficiency of Chang with regard to the invention as claimed. As claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and claims 14-15 depend from claim 10, these claims inherently contain all of the limitations of their respective base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It

is therefore submitted that claims 2-9 and 14-15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 10-12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thornton in view of Chang.

Claims 10 and 16 have been amended to require that the network device map a locally significant message to a globally significant message, which is far different than merely encapsulating a message into an IP packet. It is therefore submitted that, for the reasons as applied to claims 1 and 10, the combination of references fails to render obvious the invention as claimed in claims 10 and 16 and their respective dependent claims 11-12 and 17. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

References cited but not relied upon have been reviewed and are not considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613